



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 34667 OF 2025 (GM-POLICE)

BETWEEN:

M. H. SURESH
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
M.SC., LLB
S/O. LATE HOTTENARASIAH,
CON. NO. 18928,
CENTRAL PRISON,
MYSURU-07.

...PETITIONER



(BY SRI. M H SURESH., PARTY IN PERSON)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BENGALURU.
2. DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE



DEPARTMENT OF
PRISON AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICE,
BENGALURU.

3. CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT
CENTRAL PRISON,
MYSURU.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.B. RAVINDRANATH., AGA)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO-
ENLARGE THE PETITIONER ON PAROLE AT LEAST
2 MONTHS.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR
PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS
MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD



ORAL ORDER

The petitioner appears in person and *online*. The VI Additional District and Sessions Judge, Mysuru has convicted and sentenced the petitioner to imprisonment for life for an offence punishable under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code in SC No. 117/2005. The petitioner was working as a Lecturer, and he has served [including the remission] 12 years and 3 months in prison as of July 2025. The petitioner has filed repeated applications for *General Parole*, and each of these applications have resulted in reports from the jurisdictional Police stating that he must not be admitted to parole because he will not be able to muster surety and that there would be a law and order situation in his place of residence if admitted to parole.

Sri B. Ravindranath, the learned Additional Government Advocate, is heard in the light of these



submissions. It remains undisputed that the petitioner, as a convict who has served more than 12 years in prison, can be admitted to General Parole subject to offering surety as contemplated under the Karnataka Prisons and Correctional Services Manual, 2021 [*Manual - 2021*] and he complies with the other terms. The jurisdictional Police's report, important as it is cannot be accepted pedantically and must be adjunct to the purpose of admitting a convict to parole in law. If the petitioner offers surety, he can be put on terms to ensure that there is no occasion for complaints of breach of law and order. In the peculiarities of the case, this Court is persuaded to intervene in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Hence, the following.

ORDER

[a] The petition is allowed, and the third respondent is called upon to admit the petitioner to *General Parole* of 90 days.



[b] The registry is directed to forward a certified copy of this order to the Secretary, District Legal Services Authority [DLSA], over email and the Secretary, DLSA shall ensure that it is served on the second respondent to admit the petitioner to Parole in terms of this order subject to the following conditions:

[i] The petitioner shall offer surety as contemplated under the Manual-2021 and the Secretary, DLSA shall ensure that there is due opportunity in this regard for the petitioner.

[ii] The second respondent shall ensure that the petitioner shall mark his attendance with the jurisdictional Police on every alternative day so that the petitioner's whereabouts and



conduct, while on the parole, are known.

- [iii] The second respondent shall have liberty to impose such other conditions as may be necessary for these purposes while releasing the petitioner on parole.

Sd/-
(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE